DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 831 88 IR 001 005

TITLE	NDEA III-A and ESEA II Survey Results.
INSTITUTION	North Carolina State Dept. of Public Instruction, Raleigh. Div. of Educational Media.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of School Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jul 74
NOTE	28p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Equipment; Elementary Education; *Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; Federal State Relationship; Instructional Materials; *National Surveys; Revenue Sharing; Secondary Education; State Federal Aid; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title II; ESEA Title II; National Defense Education Act Title III A; NDEA Title III A; North Carolina State Department Public Instruction

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to determine the nation's needs for future funding under both Title III-A of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA III-A) and Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA II). The North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction surveyed state officials responsible in the 50 states, five territories, the District of Columbia and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Fifty-seven NDEA III-A questionnaires were sent and 93% were returned; 95% of the ESEA II questionnaires were returned. The NDEA III-A survey found: (1) that 50 of 52 respondents have local funds available to match federal allocations for 1974, and (2) that advanced funding had a "great" effect on program effectiveness. The ESEA II survey determined that 50 out of 54 respondents believed 1974 funding was inadequate to meet state-wide needs and estimated the amount of additional funds that could have been effectively used. Both surveys estimate the total amount of federal funds that could be matched by states in 1975, 1976, and 1977. Also, both agree that federal funding should be increased. (WCM)

ED 095831

A1

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA RALEIGH

NDEA III-A and ESEA II Survey Results

CONTENTS PAGE

I.	Background of Surveys	2
II.	Summary of Results—NDEA III-A and ESEA II	3
III.	Table 1, Estimates of Need for NDEA III-A, FY 1975-1977	6
IV.	Table 2, Views of State Administrators on NDEA III-A	7
V.	Comments of Administrators on NDEA III-A	8
VI.	Table 3, Estimates of Need for ESEA II, FY 1975-1977	16
VII.	Table 4, Views of State Administrators on ESEA II	17
VIII.	Comments of Administrators on ESEA II	18
IX.	Sample Questionnaires	27

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

For further information contact: James W. Carruth, Director, Division of Educational Media, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina 27611 (Tel. 919-829-3193)

JULY 1974

IR 001 005

Background of Surveys

In May 1974 the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction surveyed state officials responsible for Title III-A of the National Defense Education Act and Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the 50 states, five territories, the District of Columbia and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. 57 NDEA III-A questionnaires were sent and 53 were completed, a 93% return. For ESEA II, 54 out of 57 questionnaires were returned, a 95% return.

The primary purpose of the survey was to determine the nation's needs for future funding under these two programs. Several other questions, such as the desirability of "forward funding" and the need for continuing the programs were included as well. See Part IX for copies of the actual questionnaires.

The questionnaire with a cover letter was sent to the chief state school officer, who was asked to request program officers to provide the information. The chief program officer in almost every case completed the questionnaire. The cover letter and a memorandum accompanying the questionnaire explained that the information provided would be used as unofficial estimates and would be provided to Congress during federal education appropriations deliberations. Respondents were told they were under no obligation to participate in the survey. For reference, total appropriations and authorizations from 1970 to 1974 were provided to the states, as were recent state-by-state allocations.

A similar questionnaire was conducted by the California State Department four years ago.

What Are NDEA III-A and ESEA II?

Title III-A of the National Defense Education Act strengthens instruction in elementary and secondary academic subjects through the purchase of equipment and materials and minor remodeling of facilities and through loans to non-public, non-profit schools.

Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides funds for purchase of school library resources, textbooks and other instructional materials used in elementary and secondary schools.

Summary of Results

NDEA III-A
(53 out of 57 responding)

The following summarizes by question the responses of state administrators of NDEA III-A.

1. **Q** Will local funds be available to match federal allocations for FY 1974 for your state?

   A Yes 50 No 2
   (Note: One state answered, "Yes, 80%; No, 20%")

2. **Q** If no (question 1), what in your judgment is the primary reason:

   A (total states responding)

   0 absence of 1973 federal allocation

   0 lack of need

   2 lack of local funds

   2 other

   Comments from the two checking "other" are as follows:
   Illinois replied, "FY 1973 and FY 1974 programs ran back to back."

   The Bureau of Indian Affairs commented, "Please note that the Bureau of Indian Affairs school operation is dependent on appropriations from the federal level. We are not required to show local funds as matching. However, each year schools will budget funds for software and hardware as it relates to the subject areas."

3. **Q** Please estimate the amount of federal funds which you believe your state needs and can match in the next three fiscal years:

   (total amount reported by states)

   A 1975 $124,693,619 1976 $130,480,000 1977 $136,022,000

4. **Q** Please check one:

   A (total states responding)

   0 We believe that the need for equipment and materials provided under Title III-A has largely been met and that the program can be phased out.

   9 We believe that NDEA Title III-A serves a valid purpose, that the needs have not been fully met, and that the program should be continued.

   44 We believe that NDEA Title III-A should not only be continued, but funding should be increased.

5. **Q** Indicate your opinion concerning the advantage of advanced funding on the effectiveness of the program:

A (total states responding)

a. 1 little or none

b. 1 some

c. 51 great

Q If (b) or (c), what would you prefer:

A 2 3 months

15 6 months

3 9 months

31 12 months

(Note: Though answering "great" in question 5, Arkansas indicated no preference in number of months.)

6. Remarks. See Part V for comments of administrators.

Summary of Results

ESEA II
(54 out of 57 responding)

The following summarizes by question the responses of state administrators of ESEA II.

1. **Q** Please estimate the amount of federal funds which you believe your state could use in the next three fiscal years:

   A (total amount reported by states)

   1975 $160,107,626 1976 $178,246,526 1977 $196,774,875

2. **Q** Were FY 1974 ESEA II funds allocated to you --

   A (total states responding)

   4 adequate to meet state-wide needs

   50 inadequate to meet state-wide needs

3. **Q** If inadequate (question 2), what additional FY 1974 funds could have been effectively used in your state?

   A (total amount reported by states)

   $74,786,006

4. **Q** Please check one:

   A (total states responding)

   0 We believe that the need for library resources provided under ESEA Title II has largely been met and that the program can be phased out.

   10 We believe that ESEA Title II serves a valid purpose, that the needs have not yet been fully met, and that the program should be continued.

   44 We believe that ESEA Title II should not only be continued, but funding should be increased.

5. Remarks. See Part VIII for comments from administrators.

TABLE I
ESTIMATES OF NEED FOR NDEA III-A
Fiscal Years 1975 - 1977
May 1974

State	1974 Allotment	Estimates of Need FY 1975	FY 1976	FY 1977
Alabama	$ 601,040	$ 1,250,000	$ 1,500,000	$ 1,500,000
Alaska	46,093	300,000	350,000	400,000
Arizona	283,906	900,000	900,000	900,000
Arkansas	316,892	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,250,000
California	2,022,468	18,500,000	19,000,000	19,500,000
Colorado	308,533	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Connecticut	273,152	600,000	600,000	500,000
Delaware	68,425	300,000	350,000	400,000
Florida	801,383	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Georgia	719,417	2,750,000	3,000,000	3,500,000
Hawaii	100,573	425,000	450,000	475,000
Idaho	123,586	600,000	600,000	600,000
Illinois	1,170,627	6,000,000	6,250,000	6,500,000
Indiana	698,869	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Iowa	383,739	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Kansas	284,277	1,500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Kentucky	510,055	2,000,000	1,900,000	1,800,000
Louisiana	665,617	4,000,000	4,000,000	3,500,000
Maine	151,626	600,000	660,000	720,000
Maryland	478,438	2,500,000	2,500,000	3,000,000
Massachusetts	571,303	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Michigan	1,173,929	8,628,619	9,000,000	10,000,000
Minnesota	555,186	2,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Mississippi	414,274	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Missouri	593,798	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Montana	115,822	400,000	500,000	500,000
Nebraska	199,992	600,000	700,000	800,000
Nevada	54,435	150,000	150,000	100,000
New Hampshire	99,440	300,000	325,000	350,000
New Jersey	704,875	2,600,000	2,750,000	2,900,000
New Mexico	203,849	650,000	700,000	750,000
New York	1,487,171	10,450,000	11,500,000	12,650,000
North Carolina	786,782	3,500,000	4,000,000	4,500,000
North Dakota	108,710	340,000	320,000	300,000
Ohio[1]	1,379,208			
Oklahoma	352,439	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Oregon	266,046	800,000	800,000	800,000
Pennsylvania	1,354,415	6,000,000	6,500,000	7,000,000
Rhode Island	98,994	700,000	700,000	700,000
South Carolina	467,538	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
South Dakota	113,209	750,000	750,000	500,000
Tennessee	601,447	2,500,000	3,000,000	3,500,000
Texas	1,691,985	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Utah	199,440	650,000	700,000	800,000
Vermont	65,432	300,000	300,000	300,000
Virginia	644,974	3,200,000	3,500,000	4,000,000
Washington	407,302	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
West Virginia	266,922	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Wisconsin	632,756	2,200,000	2,420,000	2,662,000
Wyoming	51,026	200,000	200,000	200,000
District of Columbia[1]	53,585			
Bureau of Indian Affairs	27,244	75,000	80,000	90,000
American Samoa	25,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
Guam[1]	25,000			
Puerto Rico	397,756	700,000	750,000	800,000
Virgin Islands[1]	25,000			
Trust Territory	25,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Total	**$24,767,207[2]**	**$124,693,619**	**$130,480,000**	**$136,022,000**

Footnotes: [1]Did not return questionnaire.
[2]Total 1974 allotment for states not responding to this survey was $1,482,793 and is not included in total.

TABLE 2
VIEWS OF STATE ADMINISTRATORS
ON NDEA III-A
May 1974
(See "Summary of Results" for actual questions)

State	1974 Local Funds Available		Reason Not Available				Future of Program[2]			Effect of Advance Funding			Number of Months Preferred			
	Yes	No	Absence of 1973	Lack of Need	Lack of Funds	Other	Phase Out	Continue	Continue & Increase	Little	Some	Great	3	6	9	12
Alabama	X								X			X				X
Alaska	X								X			X				X
Arizona	X								X			X				X
Arkansas	X								X			X				[4]
California	X								X			X				X
Colorado	X							X				X				X
Connecticut	X							X				X		X		
Delaware	X								X			X				X
Florida	X								X			X			X	
Georgia	X								X			X				X
Hawaii	X								X			X		X		
Idaho	X								X			X				X
Illinois	80%	20%			X	X[3]			X			X		X		
Indiana	X								X			X				X
Iowa	X								X			X			X	
Kansas	X								X			X		X		
Kentucky	X								X			X				X
Louisiana	X							X				X				X
Maine	X								X			X				X
Maryland	X								X			X				X
Massachusetts	X								X	X						
Michigan	X								X			X				X
Minnesota	X								X			X		X		
Mississippi	X							X				X		X		
Missouri	X								X			X				X
Montana	X								X			X		X		
Nebraska	X								X			X				X
Nevada		X			X			X				X				X
New Hampshire	X							X			X					X
New Jersey	X								X			X				X
New Mexico	X								X			X		X		
New York	X								X			X				X
North Carolina	X								X			X		X		
North Dakota	X								X			X	X			
Ohio[1]																
Oklahoma	X								X			X		X		
Oregon	X								X			X				X
Pennsylvania	X								X			X		X		
Rhode Island	X								X			X				X
South Carolina	X							X				X			X	
South Dakota	X								X			X				X
Tennessee	X								X			X		X		
Texas	X								X			X		X		
Utah	X								X			X				X
Vermont	X								X			X				X
Virginia	X								X			X				X
Washington	X								X			X				X
West Virginia	X								X			X				X
Wisconsin	X								X			X	X			
Wyoming	X							X				X				X
District of Columbia[1]																
Bureau of Indian Affairs		X				X			X			X				X
American Samoa	X							X				X				X
Guam[1]																
Puerto Rico	X								X			X		X		
Virgin Islands[1]																
Trust Territory	X								X			X		X		
Total	**50**	**2**			**2**	**2**		**9**	**44**	**1**	**1**	**51**	**2**	**15**	**3**	**31**

Footnotes:
[1] Did not return questionnaire.
[2] Responses indicating both "Continue" and "Continue and Increase" were counted as "Continue and Increase" only.
[3] Illinois reported, "FY73 and FY74 programs ran back to back."
[4] No answer.

Comments of Administrators on NDEA III-A

The following are the verbatim remarks on the program as reprinted from the questionnaires.

We have a great demand for money to fund NDEA III grants on a matching basis dealing with innovative, exemplary and general type programs in critical subject areas to assist curriculum.
See memo on Right to Read. (listed directly below)

Kenneth C. Grieser, Federal Programs Coordinator, Alaska

Alaska is a Right-to-Read state. More than 75% of the local school districts have made a commitment to the goal of Right-to-Read 1974-75 which means that implementation of individualized instruction, statewide, is nearing a reality. Because of this change of program, it is expected that demands and needs for multi-level, multi-media, multi-sensory materials and hardware will double beginning with FY 1975 and stay at that level for approximately five (5) years.
It is expected that the same change will take place in mathematics programs.
This change, along with population growth due to pipeline construction, will necessitate and justify doubling the allocations for Alaska.

Eula Ruby, Director, Right-to-Read, Alaska

Growth rate in Arizona is tremendous. New schools are having difficulty in equipping schools with essential equipment in sufficient quantities. Growth rate is concentrated so that pressures are on specific districts.
NDEA Title III funds are not sufficient for innovation programs. ESEA Title III projects are limited.
Private schools should be permitted to participate. Administrative funds insufficient.

Dr. Sid Borcher, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Arizona

School officials have not been requesting funds according to their needs because of the lack of funds. Even under these circumstances, the requests for the 1973 funds exceeded the funds available by more than $250,000 ($125,000 matching money). Eighty percent of the districts participated. The percent would have been higher if the approval had come earlier. Some districts had spent the matching money earlier in the year.
Industrial arts and arts and humanities have never been included in our state plan because funds were not available to fund the requests on these already included. No doubt a million dollars a year for the next three years should be spent on this area alone.

Rayburn O. Richardson, Coordinator, NDEA Title III, Arkansas

Advanced funding would help achieve the real intent of the acquisition program--strengthening instruction, enabling realistic survey of needs. Program still needed--at higher funding--for at least 2 years--then, possible phasing out.

Leonard Garber, Administrator, NDEA III-A, Connecticut

Advanced funding would provide the opportunity for more detailed needs assessment and comprehensive planning; therefore, effectiveness of the various programs would be considerably increased.

Randall L. Broyles, Assistant State Superintendent, Delaware

Most districts are just beginning to establish effective programs of individualized instruction. The alternative to an over abundance of teachers and aides is quality audio-visual equipment and materials. Perhaps it is time to consider combining ESEA Title II and NDEA Title III into a single program.

Dr. Joseph C. Taranto, Coordinator, ESEA II and NDEA III, Florida

With our instructional programs in the critical subjects being increasingly individualized and improved, the need for more equipment and materials has become greater than ever before. It would be most advantageous for Hawaii to receive advanced funding so that plans can be made to make this program most effective.

Clarence Masumotoya, Director of Federal Programs, Hawaii

In FY 70, project applications from public school districts in Illinois were approved in the amount of $7,424,702. The Illinois allotment was $1,445,776. Illinois could have used at least $3,712,000. Illinois uses a variable reimbursement rate and in FY 70, this rate varied from a minimum reimbursement of 10% to a maximum reimbursement of 19.5% More than 4/5 of the cost of instructional equipment and materials was borne by the local education agency. The 1970 Fiscal year discouraged many districts from participating in future acquisition programs.

In FY 71, project applications from public school districts in Illinois were approved in the amount of $7,362,798. The Illinois allotment was $1,984,149. Illinois could have used at least $3,682,000. The reimbursement rate varied from 10% to 25%. More than 3/4 of the cost of materials was assumed by the local district. More districts became discouraged.

In FY 72, project applications from public school districts in Illinois were approved in the amount of $6,074,663. The Illinois allotment was $2,033,514. Illinois could have used at least $3,037,000. The reimbursement rate varied from 20% to 33%. Fewer districts are participating in the program. (continued)

To counteract a serious non-participation trend in Illinois and to encourage more schools to participate, the Title III, NDEA, Acquisition Program was changed to an allotment per district. This change worked very well with the FY 73 funds since the reimbursement rate was increased to 50%. However, when only $1,170,000 was released to Illinois in FY 74, the allotment for many small districts was so little that it wasn't worthwhile for them to file an application. As a result, fewer districts are participating each year and Illinois is to the point where only one-half of the districts file applications.

Earl D. Patton, Assistant Superintendent, Illinois

There is a continuing need for materials and equipment in all the critical areas. Because these programs are developing and the cost of items are high, the entire State NDEA Title III allocation would not have met half the needs. The need will continue to grow over the next years.

Indiana's need was more than three times the allocation granted.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to identify the impact of NDEA Title III funds being spent on the education of each child, each year. However, the impact of NDEA III can be seen and felt in all the programs. A reflection of this fact is evidenced by student achievement scores that have been improving over the past years. Additionally, at least 60 percent of the schools indicated that the major thrust in subject offerings has been because of NDEA Title III funding on a 50 percent level. Indeed, of all the Federal Programs, NDEA Title III has been the most effective.

Hazel M. Layden, Supervisor, NDEA Title III, Indiana

With a new subsidy law to take effect in FY '76, Maine LEAs will have available more matching funds. While some districts have an adequate supply of "hardware" for whole-class work, few systems have enough for individualized instruction and small-group work. All suffer from an inadequate supply of "software" such as film loops, filmstrips, audio- and video-tapes, science equipment and materials for individualized instructional programs, concrete devices to represent abstract mathematical concepts, materials for slow learners and LD pupils who are to be "mainstreamed" into regular classrooms. Maine has many small geographically isolated schools where pupils frequently lack contact with the "outside world." These pupils need films, filmstrips, study prints to give them some vicarious experience with which students in less remote areas have daily contact.

In brief, too many subjects are taught through a textbook approach, which cannot meet the needs of poor readers or non-readers. In many high schools only college-bound students have laboratory science experiences while the poorer reader has access only to a textbook from which he can derive little benefit--or knowledge. (continued)

Most Maine junior high schools/middle schools have no industrial art courses those which do have IA suffer from a lack of equipment.

Edward F. Booth, Coordinator, NDEA III-A, Maine

Without advanced funding it is impossible to plan for an effective program.

David R. Bender, Assistant Director, Maryland

We are currently entering a phase of providing programs to help children with a variety of learning disabilities and NDEA III funds could be of vital assistance in assisting local schools. This would be in addition to the more "normal" programs which still need considerable help to increase the quality of education.

Raymond L. Gehling, Jr., Acting Project Director, NDEA III, Massachusetts

In 1971-72, according to our State Plan, only 25% of our 600 school districts participated in NDEA III-A. Those schools overencumbered their allocations by $1,038,945. This amount in consideration of their being allocated a "specific" amount.

Michigan has recently developed the Regional Educational Media Center concept. Twenty-two have been designated. In a recent report to the Department by all 22, an amount of $5,511,784 was requested by them to enable them to offer requested services.

Charles Ruffing, Coordinator, NDEA III-A, Michigan

The need for NDEA Title III is becoming greater in Minnesota because the legislature has imposed tax limitations. This limitation will inhibit schools from spending more money on equipment. They will have matching funds available.

George F. Hoppe, Director, NDEA III, Minnesota

With funding of NDEA III-A (FY 73 and 74) being received in February 1974, the State's allotment has been committed to support projects from LEAs as of May 17, 1974. Numerous inquiries concerning availability of additional NDEA III-A funds have been received since the deadline (May 1, 1974) for submitting projects. Indications are that LEAs could and would use additional monies to support acquisition of materials and equipment to improve the instructional program in the eligible curriculum areas (continued)

A survey of recently submitted projects ('74) indicates that a majority of LEAs are in need of basic materials and equipment to carry out their instructional programs. This observation, coupled with the fact that some LEAs participated in NDEA III-A this year as a first, since the early sixties, leads us to conclude that NDEA III-A funds are needed within Mississippi to support the continued improvement of the instructional program.

The expansion of educational television capabilities within the State and changing curricula has brought a need for new types of materials and equipment.

The advanced funding of NDEA III-A, perhaps six months in advance, would enable LEAs to better plan their budgets for acquisition of materials and equipment.

G. H. Johnston, Superintendent, Mississippi

On projects to be approved with FY 73 and FY 74 funds, school districts have been encouraged to expend their funds for instructional television equipment when adequately planned to strengthen the educational programs in the ten critical areas of NDEA III. With 95% of all projects approved we have found an excellent response to this priority. This represents only one of many existing needs.

Elmer F. Klein, Director, School Learning Resources, Missouri

Requests received within recent weeks are evidence that the local education agencies are continuing to rely upon NDEA III-A for assistance, especially in planning for installations within new buildings, where bond issues drafted some months ago are no longer able to meet spiraling inflation.

(Mrs.) A. Esther Bronson, Administrator, NDEA III-A, Nebraska

This has been an extremely helpful program, but we need to do more work with the users of the equipment. Saturating them with hardware doesn't, of itself, assure better learning experiences for children.

James P. Costa, Director, Federal Programs, Nevada

Funding by July 1 would be a big improvement but at least six months lead time is needed for effective planning and budgeting.

George K. McBane, Director, NDEA III, New Mexico

Applications from local education agencies request funds far in excess of the NDEA III funding available.

Increased individualization of educational programs to respond to learner needs requires more instructional materials and equipment in lieu of the standard textbook. (continued)

Funds available under ESEA I, III and ESA are needed for other than instructional materials and equipment costs.

Centralization of materials and equipment acquisition minimizes duplication of expenditures for similar items for different projects.

P. Alistair MacKinnon, Assistant to the Commissioner, New York

I feel that it would be a very safe assumption to say that a majority of local school administrators in North Carolina would like to see the NDEA Title III-A program not only remain in existence but have increased funding.

Even though authorization for continuation of this program is provided under P.L. 92-318 until June 30, 1975, appropriation legislation is necessary to enable this program to be operational during FY 1975. The fact that the NDEA program has not been included in any administration budget causes us concern about its future.

According to a questionnaire given in 1972, this program ranked as the most popular federal education program.

Darrell Arnold, NDEA Coordinator, North Carolina

In visiting with school administrators in Oklahoma I find that they feel the NDEA program is the best program that they receive federal funding from.

M. M. Vickers, Administrator, Oklahoma

It must be pointed out that the use of ESEA Title I and III funds for equipment restrict the use of the equipment to the specific program. NDEA funds are meant to improve general school programs for the entire student body. Building programs anticipated in the next three years will have a tremendous effect on equipment needs.

Gerry W. Leonard, Coordinator, Federal Grants, Rhode Island

NDEA III has been one of the best programs ever brought forth by the Federal Government. The 50% matching request has been especially good for it has assumed that the local districts did indeed want the materials enough to use a good share of their own funds to acquire them, instead of just spending "free" federal money.

In this day of increasing demands of teachers for a larger share of local money for salary purposes, this program will be of increasing value to assure that those same teachers will have equipment with which to instruct our children.

Norris M. Paulson, Assistant Superintendent, Finance Management, South Dakota

Aids all students. Covers 95% of Programs. It generates additional local funds to aid program.

Dr. J. Maurice Roberts, Director of Interagency Relations, Tennessee

Financing public school education is getting more difficult each year. The schools in our state need all the help they can get.

R. E. Slayton, Director, Program Funds Management, Texas

Our schools are still desperately in need of resources for teaching. We have made significant gains over the past decade due to federal assistance. Without it we would have almost bare classrooms. However, that need is continuing and has nor will ever be completely met at any one point in time. Materials and equipment do wear out and need replacement. We need a continuing funding program.

Dr. LeRoy R. Lindeman, Administrator, Instructional Media Division, Utah

The cruel effects of inflation over the past four years have had the effect of lessening the impact that NDEA had made by 1968-69. We need NDEA to bring in the new technology.

Donn McCafferty, Chief, Secondary Education, Vermont

The NDEA Title III program is one of the few federal programs that permit direct participation by the recipient LEAs. With a share of this investment for equipment being borne by the local level, greater accountability is exercised to obtain the most benefit from each dollar invested. The program is flexible in that it permits the State to recognize differences between LEAs and determine the share of cost to be borne by each.

Robert V. Turner, Special Assistant for Federal Programs, Virginia

We are very much in favor of the concept of HR 69, however, under no circumstances should individual programs consolidated in HR 69 be funded for less than the appropriation level for the current fiscal year.

Cecil J. Hannan, Administrative Assistant, Federal Liaison, Washington

Much of the equipment and materials purchased in the early years of NDEA III is worn out, in need of repair, or obsolete. NDEA III is needed to relieve this situation.

Gene A. Maguran, Sr., Director Federal Programs, West Virginia

If we could know our state allotment 3 months in advance of July 1 each year, this would provide us with plenty of planning time.

Arnold M. Chandler, Administrator, NDEA III, Wisconsin

As of FY 74 our Department of Education completed four new learning centers; therefore, we plan that we use this money to help equip these centers. Four more will be constructed in FY 75 and two will be completed in FY 77. We will need this money to help buy the equipment for these new learning centers.

Aiva Filiago, NDEA Coordinator, American Samoa

This program has been extremely helpful since it enables educational agencies to acquire equipment to better their programs.

Maria I. de Jesús, Federal Programs Coordinator, Puerto Rico

Please note Bureau of Indian Affairs school operation is dependent on appropriations from the Federal level. We are not required to show local funds as matching. However each year schools will budget funds for soft and hardware as it relates to the subject areas.

NDEA III has gone a long way to upgrade subject needs; it has offered school staff the opportunity to take a critical look at subjects with the idea of strengthening, fully knowing that there are some funds available to do so. I personally feel it is a good program and has gone far in upgrading subject areas.

Gordon W. Gunderson, Chief, Bureau of Special Programs, Bureau of Indian Affairs

VI

TABLE 3
ESTIMATES OF NEED FOR ESEA II
Fiscal Years 1975 - 1977
May 1974

State	1974 Allotment	1974 Additional Funds Needed	Estimates of Need 1975	1976	1977
Alabama	$ 1,417,852	$ 500,000	$ 2,000,000	$ 2,000,000	$ 2,000,000
Alaska	146,657	100,000	300,000	350,000	400,000
Arizona	833,587	500,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
Arkansas	804,423	100,000	1,000,000	1,225,000	1,516,000
California	8,536,517	20,000,000	30,000,000	40,000,000	50,000,000
Colorado	1,026,488	350,000	1,200,000	1,212,000	1,224,120
Connecticut	1,335,140	--	1,400,000	1,500,000	1,600,000
Delaware	260,008	40,000[3]	300,000	300,000	300,000
Florida	2,704,985	3,295,015	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Georgia	1,911,403	900,000	3,000,000	3,750,000	4,000,000
Hawaii	360,767	100,000[4]	400,000	450,000	500,000
Idaho	327,988	750,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Illinois	4,876,093	5,200,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Indiana	2,307,156	--	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
Iowa	1,255,562	2,744,000[3]	2,600,000	2,750,000	2,900,000
Kansas	930,912	270,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Kentucky	1,356,508	143,492	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,500,000
Louisiana	1,669,590	500,000	2,000,000	2,500,000	3,000,000
Maine	463,249	--	463,250	577,936	557,021
Maryland	1,787,959	1,000,000	2,000,000	2,500,000	3,000,000
Massachusetts	2,429,112	--	2,500,000[5]	2,500,000[5]	2,500,000[5]
Michigan	4,198,424	500,000	5,000,000	5,500,000	6,000,000
Minnesota	1,777,743	222,000[3]	2,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Mississippi	936,130	1,000,000	2,670,000	3,192,000	3,710,000
Missouri	2,021,406	2,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Montana	326,976	30,000	350,000	360,000	360,000
Nebraska	643,619	200,000	800,000	900,000	1,000,000
Nevada	230,488	20,000[4]	250,000	250,000	250,000
New Hampshire	335,975	30,000	375,000	390,000	400,000
New Jersey	3,085,657	1,000,000	4,000,000	5,000,000	6,000,000
New Mexico	516,306	184,000[3]	750,000	800,000	850,000
New York	7,423,067	2,500,000	10,000,000	11,000,000	12,000,000
North Carolina	2,037,649	1,000,000	3,000,000	3,500,000	4,000,000
North Dakota	270,752	30,000	300,000	330,000	365,000
Ohio[1]	4,775,569				
Oklahoma	1,086,694	500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Oregon	872,473	128,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Pennsylvania	5,000,836	1,000,000[3]	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,500,000
Rhode Island	401,728	600,000	1,000,000	900,000	900,000
South Carolina	1,141,558	400,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
South Dakota	303,545	200,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Tennessee	1,587,853	500,000	2,000,000	2,500,000	3,000,000
Texas	4,979,429	20,020,000[3]	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Utah	528,228	972,000[3]	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Vermont	206,217	35,000	215,000	220,000	225,000
Virginia	1,928,041	2,000,000	4,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Washington	1,461,184	400,000	1,650,100	1,700,000	1,750,000
West Virginia	710,237	500,000	1,200,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Wisconsin	2,086,738	500,000	2,399,748	2,759,710	3,173,666
Wyoming	152,533	150,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
District of Columbia	279,769	68,893	383,528	421,880	464,068
Bureau of Indian Affairs	125,229	50,000	175,000	180,000	200,000
American Samoa	30,000	--	30,000	30,000	30,000
Guam[1]	74,769				
Puerto Rico	1,828,294	1,043,606	2,900,000	3,700,000	4,600,000
Virgin Islands[1]	66,339				
Trust Territory	86,589	10,000	96,000	98,000	100,000
Total	**$85,343,323[2]**	**$74,786,006**	**$160,107,626**	**$178,246,526**	**$196,774,875**

Footnotes:

[1]Did not return questionnaire.

[2]Total 1974 allotment for states not responding to this survey was $4,916,677 and is not included in total.

[3]The actual response seemed to be the total funds needed rather than the additional amount needed, as the question asked. Thus, this number is the difference between the amount reported and the actual 1974 allotment, rounded to the nearest $1,000.

[4]Respondent indicated this figure is a minimum.

[5]Respondent did not give an amount but commented as follows: "At the present no state funds support the development and growth of school media programs in Massachusetts. Local taxpayers' concern over mushrooming school budgets, along with increased funding priority for pupil personnel services, mean little or no support for media programs. ESEA Title II funds 3,000 local school systems, but these federal monies provide only minimal aid for local communities. Massachusetts therefore needs at least as much federal funding as has been awarded for the last two fiscal years. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title II is doing an excellent job in supporting school library media programs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and encouraging needed growth. Any reduction of ESEA Title II funds will mean a deterioration of these programs when need for their further development is being dramatically felt." Thus, this figure is an average of the 1973 Massachusetts allocation of $2,600,000 and the 1974 allocation of $2,400,000.

TABLE 4
VIEWS OF STATE ADMINISTRATORS
ON ESEA II
May 1974
(See "Summary of Results" for actual questions)

State	1974 Funds		Future of Program[2]		
	Adequate	Inadequate	Phase Out	Continue	Continue & Increase
Alabama		X		X	
Alaska		X			X
Arizona		X			X
Arkansas		X			X
California		X			X
Colorado		X		X	
Connecticut	X			X	
Delaware		X			X
Florida		X			X
Georgia		X			X
Hawaii		X			X
Idaho		X			X
Illinois		X			X
Indiana	X			X	
Iowa		X			X
Kansas		X			X
Kentucky		X			X
Louisiana		X			X
Maine	X				X
Maryland		X			X
Massachusetts		X			X
Michigan		X			X
Minnesota		X			X
Mississippi		X			X
Missouri		X			X
Montana		X			X
Nebraska		X			X
Nevada		X		X	
New Hampshire		X		X	
New Jersey		X			X
New Mexico		X			X
New York		X			X
North Carolina		X			X
North Dakota		X			X
Ohio[1]					
Oklahoma		X			X
Oregon		X			X
Pennsylvania		X			X
Rhode Island		X			X
South Carolina		X		X	
South Dakota		X			X
Tennessee		X			X
Texas		X			X
Utah		X			X
Vermont		X			X
Virginia		X			X
Washington		X			X
West Virginia		X			X
Wisconsin		X			X
Wyoming		X			X
District of Columbia		X			X
Bureau of Indian Affairs		X			X
American Samoa	X			X	
Guam[1]					
Puerto Rico		X		X	
Virgin Islands[1]					
Trust Territory		X		X	
Total	**4**	**50**		**10**	**44**

Footnotes: [1]Did not return questionnaire.
[2]Responses indicating both "Continue" and "Continue and Increase" were counted as "Continue and Increase" only.

Comments of Administrators on ESEA II

The following are the verbatim remarks on the program as reprinted from the questionnaires.

We support the activities of ESEA, Title II and urge their continuation. However, we feel it is imperative that certain programs be consolidated in such a way as to eliminate duplication of effort and paper work.

W. E. Millown, Coordinator of Federal Programs, Alabama

We have a great demand for money to fund special purpose grants dealing with innovative, exemplary, and general types of library programs to assist curriculum. The requests this year were for $80,000 and we funded only $40,000. See memo on Right-to-Read. (listed directly below)

Kenneth C. Grieser, Federal Programs Coordinator, Alaska

Alaska is a Right-to-Read state. More than 75% of the local school districts have made a commitment to the goal of Right-to-Read 1974-75 which means that implementation of individualized instruction, statewide, is nearing a reality. Because of this change of program, it is expected that demands and needs for multi-level, multi-media, multi-sensory materials and hardware will double beginning with FY 1975 and stay at that level for approximately five (5) years. It is expected that the same change will take place in mathematics programs. This change, along with population growth due to pipeline construction, will necessitate and justify doubling the allocations for Alaska.

Eula Ruby, Director, Right-to-Read, Alaska

Administrative funds should be increased. Funding should be increased to include the purchase of equipment. Uncertainties and late funding has not permitted wise planning. Materials have increased greatly in cost.

Dr. Sid Borcher, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Arizona

The libraries in our state have been greatly enhanced by the resources provided under Title II ESEA during the past few years. Without these funds, many children would be deprived of any fairly acceptable library resources. We feel that Title II should be a priority program for funding in federal education appropriations.

Mrs. Corliss M. Howard, Coordinator, ESEA II, Arkansas

At least an increase of 40 percent in State allocation is necessary just to keep even with inflation. It is estimated that over $120,000,000 would be required to bring California school library media centers up to minimum standards in all media. This is over and beyond State and local effort of about $25,000,000 a year for materials.

Claude W. Hass, Program Administrator, ESEA II, California

Since 1967 there has been a small increase in the average number of books per pupil. However, the average number of audiovisual items has increased significantly as indicated by the fact that the Fall Report for 1967 did not even ask for a reporting of such materials. Much of the trend away from book-oriented libraries toward instructional materials centers can be attributed to ESEA II funding. In addition, districts have been able to expand district-level materials collections, especially in the fields of 16mm films and expensive multi-media kits. Funds from ESEA II have allowed districts to implement innovative and creative media programs or to attain depth in specialized subject areas. Again, the report from Colorado Springs gives a fairly typical view of how ESEA II has improved school media centers in the state.

Anne Marie Falsone, School Library Consultant, Colorado

Title II has been a main impetus in centralizing school library media centers. There are still schools without a library, but these are now in the minority. The greatest need is in poorer towns, in elementary schools where local budgets are meager.

Theresa McKeon, Title II Coordinator, Connecticut

ESEA Title II has allowed us to start basic libraries in all schools. Unfortunately, they are totally inadequate to serve the student population. Because of the small amount allocated to Delaware, we are barely able to keep pace with student needs, curriculum changes, or increases in the cost of library resources.

Richard L. Kreuger, Supervisor, ESEA II and Library/Media Services, Delaware

The estimates given are conservative. One must realize that even established libraries need funds for updating collections, providing replacement items for worn items, etc.

The consolidation of compatible categorical programs is in order. NDEA, Title III and ESEA, Title II are examples of compatible categorical programs which could logically be combined without destroying their effectiveness.

Dr. Joseph C. Taranto, Coordinator, ESEA II and NDEA III, Florida

Increased allowances for Administration should be built into the ACT. Salaries in Hawaii (for all workers, clerical and professional) have increased with the advent of unionism for State employees. Rental costs have soared for office space, utilities, office equipment and supplies, telephone and cable communications, etc. It is difficult to keep Administration costs within the $50,000 limitation; consequently additional costs have been shuffled to Acquisition (ordering, processing, etc.) thus cutting into the actual acquisition of materials that are much needed for the benefit of children and teachers in providing better educational opportunities.

Arline Schiller, Program Specialist, ESEA II, Hawaii

Uncertainty of the availability of Title II, ESEA funds makes planning at both state and local levels difficult. Correspondence from local school districts indicated that a high value is placed upon the Title II, ESEA program as a means for increasing both quantity and quality of library/media materials in the state.

Earl D. Patton, Assistant Superintendent, Illinois

The ESEA Title II program in Iowa has provided the funds to the sixteen regional educational media centers for the purchase of school library resource materials. All ESEA Title II money in Iowa is allocated to the centers. Without ESEA Title II funds in Iowa we would be hurt drastically in furthering the concept of and services provided by our regional educational media centers. New state legislation mandates area media services and provides little or no funds for the purchase of materials. We are therefore relying on continued federal funds i.e. ESEA Title II.

Paul L. Spurlock, Chief, Educational Media Section, Iowa

Forward funding is necessary for effective planning for full utilization of materials.

Charles E. Nicholson, Director, Curriculum and ESEA II, Kansas

The program needs to continue as it is. All children and teachers in the State of Kentucky profit from the program.

Richard I. Betz, Unit Director, Kentucky

ESEA Title II provides a variety of instructional materials for use in instructional programs where sources of study materials are limited. It also stimulates State, local and private school efforts to increase the level of funds made available for instructional materials. It encourages the operation of a school system media center in each system. It provides the system center collections of materials too professional or specialized to be feasibly maintained in individual schools. It provides the school media center adequate collections of print and non-print materials to meet the needs of students and teachers in the teaching-learning process. (continued)

The accomplishment under Title II programs has been outstanding. Since it went into operation, thousands of local schools have improved library resources and other instructional materials.

This program has brought the libraries up to date and is keeping them current.

Jesse G. Milner, Director ESEA II, Louisiana

We have begun to develop regional resource centers with ESEA Title II. Without the continuation of funding, progress in this area will be greatly impeded.

John Boynton, Coordinator, Media Services, Maine

Advanced funding is also needed for this program.

David R. Bender, Assistant Director, Maryland

Materials continue to increase in price. New students with new needs come along; materials wear out or turn up missing and must be replaced; there is a continuing need for more and better materials. Congress should increase the funding each year, at least enough to keep pace with these continuing needs.

Mary Ann Hanna, Coordinator, ESEA II, Michigan

This supplement, if lost, will not be supplied by local funds because of tax limitations on our LEAs. Our local maintenance of effort has steadily increased due to the impact of Title II. This impact would be lost. Private schools would be without any assistance if Title II is discontinued.

George F. Hoppe, Director, ESEA II, Minnesota

Some identified merits of the Title II program in Mississippi are as follows:

Teachers have become accustomed to having alternatives when planning instructional activities. These alternatives are made possible through the reservoirs of relevant instructional materials--the school media centers.

Sixty percent (60%) of all school districts report that one of their most critical needs is providing materials for the underachiever. A majority of these school administrators agree that the added materials for the underachiever provided through ESEA II have contributed to an increase in the achievement level of students.

Materials have been purchased that support special programs such as special education, environmental education, career education, drug education, and sex education.

G. H. Johnston, Superintendent of Education, Mississippi

Since the beginning of the Title II, ESEA program in 1965-66 the number of central libraries in the public elementary and secondary schools has increased by 116%. Certificated librarians employed in these schools have increased by 94%. A combination of local, state, and federal funds has been sufficient to bring less than one-half of the central library collections up to the state standards required for classification and accreditation of the districts.

More than 95% of the pupils enrolled in the public and private, elementary and secondary schools have participated annually in the Title II ESEA program. This attests to the popularity of the program and the effectiveness of its administration.

Elmer F. Klein, Director, School Learning Resources, Missouri

In a rural state such as Montana, there are many schools who would not even have a library resource available, if it were not for ESEA Title II funds. The need certainly exists and as educational costs increase, the need for federal assistance for library resources increases.

Dr. Robert A. Lehman, Director, Finance and General Support for Schools, Montana

Title II is the backbone of the concept of a media program. We need it to continue as a source for materials as LEAs accept the media program concept and cover full staffing to try to meet educational needs.

(Mrs.) A. Esther Bronson, Administrator, ESEA II, Nebraska

This is an excellent program which can be coordinated effectively with NDEA Title III-A.

James P. Costa, Director, Federal Programs, Nevada

The Title II ESEA program has served as seed money to stimulate LEAs to develop library/media programs. In a few districts with low tax bases it actually provides services not otherwise available. By helping nonpublic school children (from 1/5 to 1/6 of New Jersey children not in public schools) it has helped to insure local support of the public schools. Some counties in New Jersey have from 1/3 to 1/2 of the children in nonpublic schools. Schools in this state are largely supported by local property taxes.

Anne Voss, Coordinator, ESEA II, New Jersey

The figures (listed elsewhere in the questionnaire) are conservative estimates which would allow for the same slow rate of growth we are now experiencing. To fully meet the estimate of Title II to provide an effective library/media program for all children would require an additional 50%.

George K. McBane, Director, ESEA II, New Mexico

The State's and Nation's Right-to-Read effort cannot succeed without the support of strong school library media programs which lead students to want to read.

Minimal collections have not yet been achieved in many schools, in both the book and audio-visual areas.

On the positive side, fewer than one percent of the schools do not have school libraries today.

Inflation has seriously decreased the amount of materials we anticipated would be acquired after eight years of the program.

Centralization of materials and equipment acquisition minimizes duplication of expenditures for similar items for different projects.

Funds available under ESEA I, III, ESA etc. are needed for educational expenditures other than school library resources.

P. Alistair MacKinnon, Assistant to the Commissioner, New York

The need for additional materials as well as increased inflation has caused the buying power to decrease. Additional materials are needed to carry out a good instructional program.

Carroll R. Calhoun, Chief Consultant, ESEA II, North Carolina

The reception of Title II ESEA in the State of North Dakota by local education agencies has been excellent. It is a very popular program because the red tape involved is at a minimum. School districts need and appreciate the allocations given to them each year for their library centers. Local school districts hope that the program will continue at least at the present level of funding but hope for an increase due to the rising costs of materials.

Elmer Huber, Coordinator, ESEA II, North Dakota

We feel that this program is essential to any instructional program by providing additional resource materials.

M. M. Vickers, Administrator, Oklahoma

The inflated cost of materials has decreased the purchasing power of allocated funds. The needs continue as curricular trends change. This program represents a partnership among federal, state and local agencies with materials coming from one source, staff and facilities from others. It has served very well and must be continued.

(Mrs.) Elizabeth P. Hoffman, Chief, Division of School Library Services and Coordinator of ESEA II, Pennsylvania

The use of media has become more essential in total instructional programs in all schools. At present, no school district in the state has an adequate supply of media materials to meet the ever increasing demands.

Donald C. Pearce, Coordinator of Federal Funding, South Carolina

The library has become a very important factor in the learning environment we are trying to provide for our children. A library learning center can be the core about which the teacher can break out of her classroom and the limitation of her class textbook and take advantage of other available aids. The number of things that could be used in this fashion is almost endless. High schools are becoming moderately well supplied with library media materials but the elementary schools and middle schools are still very lacking. Considering that Title II, ESEA does not require local matching, almost any money available could be advantageously used.

Norris M. Paulson, Assistant Superintendent, Finance Management, South Dakota

The Agency is in the third year of a state wide instructional resources program study. Early estimates indicate an annual expenditure of $30,000,000. The five components being considered in the program are: professional development, adoption of instructional materials, instructional resources information, learning resource centers, and instructional resources technological and dissemination.

R. E. Slayton, Director, Program Funds Management, Texas

We are emphasizing the individualization of instruction. We cannot do so without resources. We are extremely limited and need more funding for this purpose.

Dr. LeRoy R. Lindeman, Administrator, Curriculum Division, Utah

ESEA Title II has not only assisted elementary school libraries already functioning, but has sparked interest in small communities to start libraries where there had been none. The greatest need is still in elementary schools throughout the State, and secondary schools are now requesting that some Title II funds be directed their way. Additional funds would allow us to reinstate the Special Purpose Grant program for secondary schools.

ESEA Title II is also the only source of funds for the State Department of Educations's administration of the School Library/Media services. If Title II goes out, the position of School Library/Media Consultant would be in jeopardy.

Eleonora P. Harman, School Library/Media Consultant, Vermont

Most of the school libraries, even the ones in the smaller elementary schools, are on the verge of implementing a unified media approach to teaching and learning and are striving to become true media centers. Much effort in the past has been devoted to attaining State standards for print materials. Title II assistance has been instrumental in meeting these basic goals and helping with beginning audio-visual collections. Other funds can be used to maintain the status quo, but Title II funds can provide the extra push for real on-going growth and expansion.

An effort has been made to meet certain identified special needs through the use of Title II funds for Special Projects. The applications for these projects always exceed available funds. Additional Title II funds could be used expeditiously to fund a greater number of these projects and to provide funding more nearly at the level requested since partial funding prevents full implementation as envisioned by the project designers.

Robert V. Turner, Special Assistant for Federal Programs, Virginia

Under the Title II program existing school libraries in Washington State have been greatly expanded; learning resources, both print and non-print, are more readily available and accessible to children and teachers in both public and private schools. Through the Special Needs grants, instructional programs in many of the school districts have been affected significantly.

Cecil J. Hannan, Administrative Assistant, Federal Liaison, Washington

The amount of red tape involved in arriving at "relative need" at the local level is tremendous.

Gene A. Maguran, Sr., Director, Federal Programs, West Virginia

The ESEA Title II program has provided materials to support instructional approaches that coincide with the present day learning habits of students. It has motivated schools to use their own funds to purchase library materials, especially audio-visual materials. This allows the educational practices used in schools to compare with the other learning sources.

Many of our schools have indicated that without ESEA Title II funds a large number of resources needed for students and teachers at schools would go unmet. The funding level for resources is low and the rising cost of materials also limits quantity and quality of materials that can be purchased.

Gwendolyn G. Lightfoot, Coordinator, ESEA II, District of Columbia

ESEA grant makes it possible to aid the parochial schools of American Samoa and without it we could not give aid to these schools.

Mildred S. Councill, Supervisor of Libraries, American Samoa

These funds are extremely needed. The School Library Program in Puerto Rico is making every effort to offer services that could gradually meet the needs of our students. Our School System has a population of 713,166 students with an average of 1 library per 1,654 pupils. The availability of funds for the improvement and expansion of the service is vital for a better education and learning achievement of our children.

Maria I. de Jesús, Federal Programs Coordinator, Puerto Rico

It is the only program by which librarians receive funds on a regular annual basis; planning and meaningful development of library resources would be far more effective if funding could be a certainty over a period of several years. In other words, it is not so much a matter of the amount of funding as it is a need to be provided a certainty that funds will be provided over a sustained period of time.

Daniel J. Peacock, Supervisor, Library Services, Mariana Islands

Through ESEA Title II many of the small isolated schools common to the Bureau of Indian Affairs school operation have received a minimal collection of both print and non-print materials. We have also seen greater emphasis on providing library and media services to these outlying areas. The use of Title II and regular program funds has offered an opportunity to concentrate services in the schools of greatest need.

Gordon W. Gunderson, Chief, Bureau of Special Programs,
Bureau of Indian Affairs

IX

ESTIMATES OF NEED FOR TITLE III–A OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT
Sponsored by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

May, 1974 **State:**_____

Below are allotments and past estimates of needs for NDEA III–A in your state for fiscal years 1972–1974. (The estimates were prepared by your state NDEA III–A office three years ago and were submitted as Congressional testimony at that time.)

1973		1974	
Estimated Need	Allotment	Estimated Need	Allotment
$	$	$	$

1. Will local funds be available to match federal allocations for FY 1974 for your state? _____Yes _____No

2. If no, what in your judgment is the primary reason:
   _____ absence of 1973 federal allocation
   _____ lack of need
   _____ lack of local funds
   _____ other_____

3. Please estimate the amount of federal funds which you believe your state needs and can match in the next three fiscal years.

1975	1976	1977
Estimated Need	Estimated Need	Estimated Need
$_____	$_____	$_____

4. Please check:
   a._____We believe that the need for equipment and materials provided under Title III–A of NDEA has largely been met and that the program can be phased out.
   b._____We believe that NDEA Title III–A serves a valid purpose, that the needs have not yet been fully met, and that the program should be continued.
   c._____We believe that NDEA Title III–A should not only be continued, but funding should be increased.

5. Indicate your opinion concerning the advantage of advanced funding on the effectiveness of the program.
   a._____little or none
   b._____some
   c._____great
   If (b) or (c), what would you prefer?
   _____3 months; _____6 months; _____9 months; _____12 months

6. Remarks. Please feel free to provide any comments you might have on the program, the need for the program, merits of the program, funding levels, etc. Use the space below to write in your remarks. Feel free to use additional sheets.

ESTIMATE OF NEED FOR TITLE II OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
Sponsored by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

May, 1974 **State:**_____

1. Below are allotments for ESEA II in your state for fiscal years 1972–1974. Please estimate the amount of federal funds which you believe your state could use in the next three fiscal years.

Allotment			Estimated Need		
1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
$	$	$	$_____	$_____	$_____

2. Were FY 74 ESEA II funds allocated to you–

_____ Adequate to meet state-wide needs

_____ Inadequate to meet state-wide needs

3. If inadequate, what additional FY 1974 funds could have been effectively used in your state? $_____

4. Please check one:

_____ We believe that the need for library resources provided under ESEA Title II has largely been met and that the program can be phased out.

_____ We believe that ESEA Title II serves a valid purpose, that the needs have not yet been fully met, and that the program should be continued.

_____ We believe that ESEA Title II should not only be continued, but funding should be increased.

5. Remarks. Please feel free to provide any comments you might have on the program, the need for it, the merits of the program, funding levels, etc. Use the space below, the back of this page or additional sheets.

Please type or print the following information.

Signed:_____

Title:_____

Agency:_____

Address:_____

City:_____

State:_____ **Zip Code**_____

Telephone: (AC)_____

IMPORTANT: Please return this questionnaire via airmail by ***Friday, May 24*** in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. (To: James W. Carruth, Director, Division of Educational Media, North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina 27611) Thank you.